

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 13-21, 23, 24, 26-37, 39, 41-50, 56-61, 63, 64, and 66-69 stand rejected. Claims 7-12, 22, 25, 38, 40, 51-55, 62, and 65 stand objected to. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 15-19, 21, 24, 26, 34-36, 39, 41-44, 48, 56-59, 61, and 64 are amended herein. Claims 2, 3, 37, 38, 51, and 67-69 are hereby canceled; thus, claims 1, 4-36, 39-50, and 52-66 remain pending. No new matter has been added. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

Claims 1-6, 13-21, 23, 24, 26-37, 39, 41-50, 56-61, 63, 64, and 66-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,944,150 to McConnell. The Applicant notes that in the July 11, 2007 advisory action the Examiner acknowledged that McConnell should be used as a 102(e) reference. The Applicant will therefore treat the rejection as a 102(e) rejection. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 now recites, in part, an access device configured to receive the first wireline communication, to transmit the second wireline communication, to receive the first wireless communication, and to transmit the second wireless communication. McConnell does not disclose an access device that transmits and receives wireline communications. The mobile station of McConnell communicates wirelessly with a base station (see col. 6, lines 31-33, fig. 1). The mobile station does not have the capability for transmitting and receiving wireline communications. The wireless communications from the mobile station might later be converted to wireline in the MSC for use in the PSTN (see col. 6, lines 49-52). However, the mobile station does not transmit and receive the wireline communications itself. Therefore, the mobile station of McConnell does not transmit and receive wireline communications as indicated for the access device in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's characterization of McConnell does not set forth each and every element of claim 1 as arranged by claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowed accordingly.

Claim 27 recites, in part, an access device configured to receive the at least one wireline communication from the wireline switch and the at least one wireless communication from the wireless switch. The Office action indicates that McConnell

discloses “an access device configured to receive the at least one wireline communication and the at least one wireless communication (col. 6, lines 31-43).” (Page 5 of the Office action.) The mobile station of McConnell receives only wireless communications over an air interface, as discussed above. More specifically, any wireline communication must be converted to a wireless communication before being received by the McConnell mobile station. Thus, McConnell does not teach or suggest that the mobile station is configured to receive both a wireline communication and a wireless communication, as set forth in claim 27. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that claim 27 is allowable in view of McConnell, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Claim 36 now recites, in part, a multiplexer configured to demultiplex the wireline communication and the wireless communication, and process the wireline communication and the wireless communication with an inverse multiplex asynchronous transfer mode protocol to generate another communication. This amendment to claim 36 incorporates the limitations of allowable dependent claim 38. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that claim 36 is allowable, and such indication is respectfully requested.

The limitations of dependent claim 37 have also been incorporated into claim 36. Dependent claims 37 and 38 are hereby canceled.

Claim 48 now recites, in part, using an inverse multiplex asynchronous transfer mode protocol to process at least one member of a group consisting of the wireless communication and the wireline communication. This amendment to claim 48 incorporates the limitations of allowable dependent claim 51. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that claim 48 is allowable, and such indication is respectfully requested. Dependent claim 51 is hereby canceled.

While separately allowable, the Applicant refrains from a discussion of dependent claims 4-6, 13-21, 23, 24, 26, 28-35, 39, 41-47, 49, 50, 56-61, 63, 64, and 66 in view of their dependence from otherwise allowable independent claims.

Claims 7-12, 22, 25, 40, 52-55, 62, and 65 are objected to as depending from rejected base claims. The respective independent claims are allowable as currently recited and the Applicant requests allowance of dependent claims 7-12, 22, 25, 40, 52-55, 62, and 65.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant thus respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

The Applicant hereby authorizes the Office to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765 the appropriate fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(1) for a one-month extension of time. The Applicant believes no additional fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine additional fees are necessary, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kyle J. Way/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Kyle J. Way, Reg. No. 45,549

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2280

E-mail: kyle@setterroche.com

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Steven J. Funk

Sprint

6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100

Overland Park, KS 66251-2100